# READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MINUTES VIRTUAL REGULAR MEETING February 8, 2021

The Meeting was called to order by Chair Monaco at 7:00 p.m. stating that the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act have been met and that this meeting had been duly advertised.

CHAIR MONACO ANNOUNCED THAT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH THE EXECUTIVE ORDERS SIGNED BY THE GOVENOR AND IN AN EFFORT TO FOLLOW BEST PRACTICES RECOMMENDED BY THE CDC, THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED VIRTUALLY FOR ALL BOARD MEMBERS, BOARD PROFESSIONALS, APPLICANT AND APPLICANT'S TEAM, ANY INTERESTED PARTIES AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ARE INVITED TO VIEW MEETINGS LIVE USING WEBEX WHICH ALLOWS THEM TO "RAISE A HAND" AND CONTRIBUTE WITH VOICE AND VIDEO DURING THE PUBLIC PORTIONS OF THE MEETING. MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO ARE CALLING IN BY PHONE WILL ALSO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRIBUTE WHEN CALLED UPON TO SPEAK.

## ROLL CALL

Board Members in Attendance:

Albanese, J.

Allen, J.

Cook, J.

Duffy, E.

Filler, C.

Fort, B.

Mueller. A.

John, C.

Monaco, R.

Rohrbach, T.

Hindle, J.

## **Others Present:**

Board Attorney Jonathan Drill, Esq., Board Planner Michael Sullivan, Board Engineer Rob O'Brien, Board Environmental Consultant Jack Szczepanski, Board Traffic Engineer Jay Troutman and Board Secretary Ann Marie Lehberger

### **MINUTES**

Mr. Mueller moved, and Mr. Albanese seconded a motion to approve the January 25, 2021 minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

Letter from Glenn S. Pantel Esq. dated 2/1/21

Re: Chubb INA Holdings, Inc./Rosedale & Rosehill Cemetery Association, Co-Applicants-Application for Conditional Use, and Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval Block 12, Lots 16 & 16.01.

Ms. Duffy recused herself.

Chair Monaco noted that a letter was received from Attorney Glenn Pantel regarding the application for Chubb INA Holdings, Inc./Rosedale & Rosehill Cemetery Association that will be coming back in front of the Planning Board.

Ms. Duffy returned to the meeting.

# **RESOLUTIONS**

Readington Brewery LLC (Resolution#2020-16)

Block 76 Lot 5-937 Route 202

Appl#PB19-010- Amended Preliminary & Final Site Plan- Revisions to Stormwater Management

Approved with conditions 12/14/20

Mr. Albanese moved, and Ms. Filler seconded, a motion to adopt the resolution for Readington Brewery LLC. The roll call vote follows:

Member	Motion	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Not Eligible	Recused
Albanese	X		X					
Allen			X					
Cook			X					
Filler		X	X					
Fort							X	
John			X					
Mueller			X					
Duffy							X	
Monaco			X					
Rohrbach			X					
Alternate #1								
Hindle							X	
Alternate #2								

# Ryland Inn Property LLC (Resolution#2020-15)

Block 14 Lot 29- 111 Old Highway 28

Appl#PB18-011- Amended Preliminary & Final Site Plan with Variances Approved with conditions 9/14/20

Ms. Filler moved, and Ms. Duffy seconded, a motion to adopt the resolution for Ryland Inn Property LLC. The roll call vote follows:

Member	Motion	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Not Eligible	Recused
Albanese			X					
Allen			X					
Cook			X					
Filler	X		X					
Fort							X	
John			X					
Mueller			X					
Duffy		X	X					
Monaco			X					
Rohrbach			X					
Alternate #1								
Hindle							X	
Alternate #2								

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Discussion- Stormwater Ordinance

The Board discussed the proposed revisions to the stormwater ordinance that were drafted by the subcommittee and the Board's Environmental Consultant Jack Szczepanski from Princeton Hydro. Ms. Rohrbach provided some additional comments and suggested revisions. It was determined that the changes that were discussed this evening would be incorporated into the draft and presented again at the next meeting.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

# **Solberg Aviation Company**

Appl# PB18-014- Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan- Paving and Rehabilitation of Runway and associated improvements Block 56 Lots 3 & 6

Chair Monaco, Mr. Albanese, Ms. Allen and Ms. Fort recused themselves from the application and left the meeting. Vice-Chair Duffy took over the meeting.

Attorney Martin Newmark was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Newark confirmed that the applicant was present seeking preliminary & final site plan approval with variances for paving and rehabilitation of the runway with associated improvements. He noted that they would be presenting three witnesses.

The following individuals were present and sworn in for the applicant: Dennis Yap, PE, applicant's engineer
Wendy Yu, applicant's engineer
Bill Romaine, applicant's environmental expert
John McDonough, PP, LA, applicant's planner and landscape architect

Board Planner Michael Sullivan, Board Engineer Rob O'Brien, Board Environmental Consultant Jack Szczepanski and Board Traffic Engineer Jay Troutman were also sworn.

Dennis Yap, the applicant's engineer was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. Mr. Yap provided some history of the airport and gave an overview of the application as follows: Runway 4-22 at the airport has a length of 3,735 feet consisting of 3,000 feet of paved runway and 735 feet of turf runway. The proposal is to pave the existing 735-foot turf portion and rehabilitate the remaining 3,000 feet of the runway. The proposal also includes the replacement of runway edge lights, installation of new Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL), installation of new Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPI) and construction of a new stormwater basin to manage runoff from the additional pavement.

Mr. Yap presented an exhibit that was marked into evidence as follows:

A-1 PDF of PowerPoint Presentation titled Runway 04/22 Rehabilitation Solberg Hunterdon Airport

Referencing Exhibit, A-1, Mr. Yap provided testimony as follows: The runway has not been rehabilitated for 30 years and is in need of repairs. The project is sponsored by the New Jersey Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics and 90% of the funding is coming from grants from the DOT's (Department of Transportation) transportation fund. To account for the increase in impervious coverage, an infiltration basin will be added. The runway edge lights will be replaced along with the addition of Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL) and Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) lights. The project has been designed using FA standards. The proposed project will not increase the current ability of the airport. The existing grass area at the end of the runway will be regraded flat and used as a runway safety area. Transverse joints will be added to the pavement every 80 feet or so to help control cracking. The condition of the existing pavement on the runway is deteriorating and needs to be addressed to maintain the safety of the runway. Mr. Yap described the stormwater management plan for the site and confirmed that the applicant can satisfy the comments from the Board's professionals in their reports regarding stormwater management. Mr. Yap described the proposed lighting plan as follows: The existing runway edge lights will be replaced with LED lights that will be bi-directional meaning that the majority of the light will be directed towards the center of the runway. There are two proposed Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL) that give pilots rapid identification of the location of the runway. They are only turned on remotely by pilots when approaching the runway and will be on a timer. There are two proposed Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) lights. The lights will be controlled on a photocell sensor that will kick in in when it is dark or in cloudy conditions. Mr. Yap explained that the airport is rated as a non-precision instrument runway that has a minimum of one mile visibility meaning the airport can be accessed if the visibility conditions are clear for up to one mile.

The Board questioned if there would be any change in the visibility of the lighting or the runway from the road. Mr. Yap explained that there is an adequate tree line buffer and

noted that the new edge lights will be bi-directional so the intensity of the light will be pointed to the center of the runway.

The Board questioned if the lighting would be visible from the highest portion of Thor Solberg Road. Mr. Yap stated due to the distance and slope it would only be slightly visible and would look like a light in the backyard of someone's house.

In response to a question from the Board, Wendy Yu, the applicant's engineer confirmed that the distance from the closest edge of the proposed detention basin to the fence along Thor Solberg Road is 30 feet.

Mr. Yap provided closing comments confirming that the project is not an implementation of the 1997 Airport Master Plan. He explained that it is a repair of the existing pavement with the addition of lights that are consistent with the capability of the airport today. He noted that the project has been classified by the DOT (Department of Transportation) as a safety project. Mr. Yap explained that he has worked on many similar airports projects all of which did not result in additional traffic or additional capabilities of traffic to the airport and the nature of the airports did not change.

The Board took a break at 9:15 pm and returned at approximately 9:25 pm.

Board Planner Michael Sullivan requested clarification as to the extent of grading at the end of the runway and the extent the applicant is exceeding two feet in grade. Mr. Yap explained that there is not a one point drop but rather sloping over a distance. Mr. Yap agreed to do further review and provide confirmation as to whether any additional variances were needed at the next meeting.

Board Planner Michael Sullivan also questioned how landings are currently done at night or in bad weather without the PAPI or REIL lights. Mr. Yap explained that they are done using available instrumentation. Mr. Sullivan also questioned if the new additional lighting would facilitate increased utilization of the airport at night. Mr. Yap stated that it would not change the 1-mile visibility rule noting it would just make it safer to land.

In response to question from the Board, Mr. Yap confirmed that airplanes can currently use instrument landings at the airport.

Board Engineer Rob O'Brien questioned what the existing turf runway was made of. Mr. Yap stated it was soil and turf.

Board Environmental Consultant Jack Szczepanski questioned the possibility of extending the swale to avoid disturbance of the wetlands. Mr. Yap stated that they did look at other possible options but due to the slope in the area, they believe this is the best option.

The Board questioned what the means of construction would be to go through the wetlands. Mr. Yap stated it would be an open trench. Mr. Yap also noted that the plan was

approved by the DEP (Department of Environmental Protection).

The Board questioned if any soil would be imported or exported from the site or if any cut would be distributed on site. Mr. Yap stated that a final determination has not been made but explained that they are considering disposing the portion they are cutting off site. He noted that they would prefer to keep it on site if the Board professionals were amenable to that option.

The Board questioned what was done to consider the possible extension of the swale. Mr. Yap stated that they looked at regrading, but the current proposal works most naturally and is the most unintrusive and efficient option.

The Board questioned the phasing of the project. Mr. Yap stated that the project is broken out into two phases. He explained that the plan is for the runway to continue to operate during Phase 1 and shut down the runway during Phase 2. He noted that the asphalt trucks would come down Lightfield Road and be kept on the runway property during construction.

The Board questioned how far on Lightfield Road the trucks would be traveling.

Board Engineer Rob O'Brien stated that Lightfield Road is a dirt road.

The Board requested some additional information on the access plan that will be used for construction vehicles and confirmation that the roads are sufficient to support the weight of the construction vehicles. It was suggested that the applicant consult with the Board's traffic consultant and Township engineer prior to the next meeting.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Yap stated that the improvements that are proposed are not intended to increase traffic on site.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Yap confirmed that the aircraft category at the airport would remain category B.

The Board questioned if there were any safety concerns with the difference in asphalt height between the existing paved area and the new proposed paved area. Mr. Yap noted that there is a dense graded aggregate that will provide support under the newly paved area.

Vice-Chair Duffy opened the public portion of the meeting for questions of Mr. Yap.

Diana Schulze of 14 Thor Solberg Road questioned if the new paved runway would be safe and allow a larger aircraft to come into the airport. Mr. Yap stated that it is designed for the same size aircraft that currently utilizes the airport, typically a propeller type aircraft.

Robert Bernier of 5 Central Court questioned if the beams from the REIL and PAPI lights

would be visible. Mr. Yap explained that it will be visible, but it will not be a direct light or laser. Mr. Bernier also questioned if the improvements would increase traffic at night. Mr. Yap sated that based on his experience with similar projects he has worked on at other small airports in NJ, there will be no increase in traffic from these improvements. Mr. Bernier also questioned why they were increasing the runway. Mr. Yap confirmed that the total runway length was not being increased.

Glen Schwesinger, 8 Forty Oaks Road questioned what would prevent the trees in the area from being cut down. Mr. Yap noted that there would be no reason to cut down any trees.

Scott Scammel, 71 Dreahook Road questioned why the public was not notified as to which Board members were recused from the application beforehand. Board Attorney Drill noted that it was not a requirement. Mr. Scammel also questioned the size of the grass runway. Mr. Yap explained that the grass area is not part of the runway but is a safety area that is 240 feet.

Michelle Jaunarajs, 101 Pulaski Road questioned the duration of the project, if work would be done at night, the effect on traffic, the number and size of construction vehicles and noise from construction. Mr. Yap explained that the schedule for the construction is 3 months, 6 weeks for each phase. He stated that there was no intention to work at night. He also stated that they will work on the traffic access plan and provide more information at next meeting but noted that they will take every provision to minimize noise. Mr. Yap confirmed that these proposed improvements will not result in increased traffic at the airport.

Dennis Fimbel, 1 Forty Oaks Road questioned if any jets could land at the airport. Mr. Yap stated that the airport is not designed for that type of aircraft or traffic.

It was announced that the application would be carried to the meeting on March 8, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. It was noted that it would be a virtual meeting and there will be new log in information for the meeting that will be provided on the agenda that will be posted on the Township website. It was also noted that those without computer and internet access can call the Board Secretary directly to obtain the call-in information. No additional notice will be provided.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Mueller moved, and Ms. Filler seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Ann Marie Lehberger Planning Board Secretary